UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,460	03/01/2004	Yigal Bejerano	129250-000999/US	9258
32498 7590 04/14/2009 CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC P.O. BOX 1995 VIENNA, VA 22183			EXAMINER	
			TORRES, MARCOS L	
VIENINA, VA 22103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2617		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application/Control Number: 10/788,460 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

ADVISORY ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3-17-09 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

2. Applicant's representative [hereinafter applicant] asserts that Menzel fail to

suggest a slot to user ratio, this limitation is as disclosed by the applicant load

dependent as it is the [# of slot] / [# of users], Menzel discloses to assign the # of slot

between the number of the users and repeating the process, thereby maximizing the

resources (see col. 4, line 64 -col. 5, line 50).

3. Regarding applicant's argument directed to the interpretation of the limitation

"maximization of a lower bound of a slot to user ratio", the interpretation given by the

examiner is consistent with paragraph 0037 of the specification. However, not all the

limitations are being read into the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In*

re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. The rest of the arguments fall for the same reasons as shown in paragraph 2 and

3 above. The rejection in record stands.

/Marcos L Torres/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617